

A World War II veteran, a lawyer, and a banker, Congressman Barnard made his mark as a well-respected leader of the House Banking Committee. He was willing to work across the aisle to do what was best for the people of Augusta and all Americans.

I was very pleased that Doug introduced and offered his support to me when I made my announcement to run for Congress. Over the years, I have sought his advice, and I have always cherished his mentorship.

Doug Barnard was a great man of faith, a friend, and a statesman. He will always be remembered and will be sorely missed—not only by me, but the entire Augusta community.

RUSSIAN TRANSPARENCY

(Mr. MEADOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, we have had a Russian narrative that has been going on because of an infamous dossier. While there has been much reported on it, I can tell you that the Intelligence Committee has been fast at work, and Chairman NUNES has been doing outstanding work to get to the truth for the American people.

Today, I had the opportunity to go into a confidential setting to make sure that what we can do is understand better what actually took place. I am here to tell all of America tonight that I am shocked to read exactly what has taken place. I would think that it would never happen in a country that loves freedom and democracy like this country.

It is time that we become transparent in all of this. I am calling on our leadership to make this available so that all Americans can judge for themselves.

CHINA'S STRATEGY TO ACCRUE GLOBAL POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 57 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I chair the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs. I have been in Congress for 5 years, and what I have noticed over the last, probably, 30 years is a growing China. China is a culture

that has been around for thousands of years. What we have seen is a growing China, but, more recently, in the last 25 years, a more aggressive China, in the policies and the different things that they do around the world.

Twenty-eight years ago, Deng Xiaoping announced that China's strategy to accrue global power would be to "hide one's strength and bide one's time." As I rise, today, in the House, this evening, it is clear that China is done biding its time.

I can remember seeing a documentary several years ago from 1986, where that leader, Deng Xiaoping, talked about that he could not compete with the U.S. or the Japanese in the intellectual property, computer manufacturing, or in IT.

What they said at that time was that they will compete by taking over the rare earth metals that are required in all of that. So, from that point forward, they led that charge to strategically set out a 100-year plan.

At China's 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China last October 2017, Xi Jinping announced a new era, in which China has started to overcome the humiliations of colonialism and that it has stood up, grown rich, and is becoming strong.

We talked about this. It came out in a meeting. Somebody brought up that, through their whole adult life, China was just kind of this big, stumbling child. But they had reached a point and grown through puberty, where the hormones had kicked in, and they found out how strong they were. Then they discovered how rich they were, and they started to flex both of those.

He explicitly offered the Chinese model as an alternative to liberal democracy. Liberal democracy, that is what the Western world and the United States rests on: allowing people to be self-determining, allowing people to be free-thinking, allowing people to be empowered. This is something that is to the antithesis of the Chinese doctrine, stating that "the banner of socialism with Chinese characteristics is now flying high and proud for all to see," offering "a new option for other countries and nations."

Mr. Speaker, as the new year begins, we must decide how we want to craft policy and legislation that will address not just Xi Jinping's so-called new era, and China's. I say that we should welcome China's effort to assume its rightful place on the world stage. But we must also reject China's efforts to undermine the values, institutions, and rules that generations of Americans have died for, along with other countries, to establish and uphold. We must never allow a socialist, authoritarian model of government, to supplant the primacy of democracy, no matter how rich and how strong the authoritarians become.

China is not choosing to rise through the global order that the United States and our allies have built with our blood and our sweat—a global order made up

of the international institutions that have held the peace since World War II; of the competitive and rules-based economic playing field; and of a free marketplace of ideas where people, not governments, decide what they will think.

Instead, China has grown to become a revisionist power—not rising within the current order, but seeking to change, subvert, or coerce it to suit China's end—not playing by the rules, but rewriting the rules to suit the needs of China.

China's foreign policy is rewriting the rules in three key areas:

First, China is replacing traditional soft power, which is based on a nation's attractiveness, with "sharp power," which leverages coerciveness. The scale is astounding. China has used sharp power to buy political influence in Australia, academic influence on American campuses, and even bought off Panama's diplomatic alliance with Taiwan. The National Endowment for Democracy, which coined the term "sharp power," has exhaustively documented China's efforts to turn Latin America elites into "de facto ambassadors of the Chinese cause"—right in our own backyard.

The world will not tolerate these coercive influence operations. Last month, Prime Minister Turnbull of Australia captured this indignation best when he used Mandarin to play on a classic Mao Zedong quote, "the Chinese people have stood up." Turnbull said that "the Australian people stand up." Congress must, likewise, ensure that the American people stand up to coercion in our politics, academia, and culture.

Second, China is rewriting the rules of engagement by using gray zone tactics that erode the distinction between peace and conflict. In the South China Sea, China has used what it has referred to as "salami slicing" to gradually attain its military objectives without provoking a confrontation, undermining the international mechanisms that are supposed to decide territorial disputes. It goes back to the saying of Deng Xiaoping: "Hide one's strength and bide one's time."

As I said, I chair the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and at one of our hearings last year, one witness testified that "by slowly changing the situation on the ground, China hopes to transform 'Asia Mediterranean' into a Chinese lake."

We can't keep standing idly by while China does these things. Xi Jinping once stood next to President Obama at the White House and pledged that he would not militarize the South China Sea.

As an aside, I was at a hearing. We were there with one of the representatives of the Chinese Government. They were talking about how everything they have done in the South China Sea was for peaceful navigational purposes. I brought up that I wish I could feel the love, or I wish I could feel the sincerity

of that, because our military satellites showed a 10,000-foot runway, our military satellites showed military barracks, our satellites showed both offensive and defensive weapons, radar systems. Yes, there was a lighthouse, but I didn't see a resort on there that showed peaceful navigational purposes.

Then he built a network of air bases, missile emplacements, radars, and ports that we had seen. Four thousand acres of the South China Sea that were dredged, destroying the environment—coral reefs—and they put in this today, which is militarized, and they don't hide it. We should look to India's example rather than accept further lies. A little resistance to China's encroachment along their disputed border has prevented the same "salami slicing" from happening on land.

And, thirdly, China is rewriting the rules of trade and economics. At a hearing before my subcommittee last year, one witness warned that "China has doubled down on its unfair, mercantilist strategies, and is now seeking global dominance in a wide array of advanced industries that are key to U.S. economic and national security interests." These zero-sum policies benefit China's domestic champions at the expense of fairness and competition in global trade.

At home, China wields its massive market as a blunt instrument, forcing foreign companies to divulge what it wants without giving them a chance to compete. Abroad, China is acquiring or stealing the industries of tomorrow, unfairly boosting its domestic innovation and hollowing out our competitors. Throughout the developing world, China has undertaken a massive infrastructure program that exports surplus industrial capacity and aligns closely with military interests.

In 2018, the United States must stand up to China's revisionism in these three key areas: sharp power influence operations, gray zone warfare, and mercantilist economics.

Some important policy steps have already begun. For example, Congressman PITTENGER has introduced legislation in the House to improve CFIUS, which is a review, and the Treasury Department has undertaken a section number, called 301 investigation into China's innovation of mercantilism.

□ 2015

These actions will help protect the future of the U.S. economy. This is a warning sign that we have seen that we must rise up to and counteract, but more must be done.

We have to blunt China's sharp power in the United States by countering Confucius institutes at schools and propaganda outlets in our cities that spread communist propaganda. We have to respond to the malicious state-sponsored activity in shared domains like the cyber realm. We have to modernize our international development work to compete with China in the developing world.

This year I will be introducing legislation to accomplish these goals, and I hope my colleagues will join me in this important work.

We must also remember that standing up for American interests means standing up for our values. Xi Jinping's leadership has turned to creeping totalitarianism. He is building an unprecedented surveillance state, increasing the communist party's ideological control of society and the reconciliation of the party's authority over every aspect of life. Human rights and civil liberties in China is worsening, and Xi Jinping must be held accountable.

In the year ahead, I hope all of my colleagues would join me in standing up for America's interests and values, and resisting China's revisionism.

After the 19th Congress, the Communist Party Congress, Xi Jinping stood up and said the era of China has arrived. No longer would China be made or forced to swallow their interests around the world, nor should they, but he also said the era of China has arrived and it is time to take the center stage.

That is a threat, and not acceptable. I don't think, to the American people. It sounds like it is a warning that they are going to throw us off the stage. However, talking to people in the administration and the rest of the world, I think we would be willing to share the stage, but to think that they are going to supplant every other country is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who used to be the chair of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee, and who has brought up some important legislation on this topic that we are talking about tonight.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank him for pulling together this Special Order here this evening.

As the gentleman mentioned, I used to be the chair of the subcommittee that he now chairs, and that is the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. I have been on the Foreign Affairs Committee for over 20 years now. We do a lot of important things on that committee, and our view of China has evolved somewhat over that time.

Do we want to have good relations with China?

Absolutely. It is in our best interests, it is in China's best interests, it is in the world's best interests. We passed normal trade relations some years ago. It used to be called the most favored nation; now it is normal trade relations. We trade with them a lot.

Many would argue that American jobs have gone to China. They have stolen our technology, our intellectual property secrets, and a whole range of other things. So they haven't been terribly cooperative in that area, yet they have benefited a great deal.

One of our strongest allies, Taiwan, the PRC—China—has been bullying for

years. Too often, China has gotten their way. They have been able to keep Taiwan out of international health organizations that would be helped by having the Taiwanese expertise in that. They have done a whole range of things.

When I first came here, there were several hundred missiles in the PRC—China—pointed at Taiwan. Now there are over 1,600 missiles, and they threaten them on a whole range of things. So it is very important that we continue to have strong relations with Taiwan.

Legislation that I have proposed and that we have passed here before in our committee and that we hope to pass in the House as well—and then we hope the Senate will take it up as well—is to allow high-ranking Taiwanese officials to come here to the United States, particularly to Washington, D.C., to meet with our officials here in our Nation's Capital. That makes sense, and hopefully we will do that in the very near future, but China has been very uncooperative, obviously, with respect to Taiwan.

They have been particularly uncooperative with respect to one of our greatest threats in the world right now, and that is North Korea. We get a lot of lip service from China, but very little action.

North Korea is a threat. For a long time, they were a threat to the region. We cared about that and we worked with our allies on that. But now they are a threat to Washington, D.C., and Seattle and Los Angeles and my home city, Cincinnati, and cities all over the United States, because we believe they can now reach the United States with nuclear weapons.

That is the first time. A lot of us were concerned about that day ever coming. Previous administrations tried to get China to lean on North Korea because China has the greatest clout with North Korea because China provides most of their food and most of their fuel. About 90 percent of North Korea's trade is with China. China acts like they are going to be helpful, and then they are not.

The last thing we want to see is military confrontation. You will have some folks in our country that that is their principal priority, they don't want any confrontation, but then they will be satisfied to have North Korea have nuclear weapons.

We can't tolerate somebody as unpredictable, somebody as dangerous as Kim Jong-un or his predecessors, his father or grandfather, people like that to have nuclear weapons. It is just unacceptable to the United States and most other countries around the world, but the rest of the world looks to us to act.

This is a case where we really do need China to step up and do the right thing. Thus far, they have not been willing to do that.

So the question is: How do we get China to do that?

In the past, a number of us thought the way you got China's attention was

to at least discuss with our allies in the region—South Korea, Japan, even Taiwan, perhaps—to consider having nuclear weapon programs themselves. And maybe even talking about that would be off-putting enough to the PRC that they would lean on North Korea to back off their program.

Well, we are probably beyond that now because North Korea not only has a nuclear program, but they have one that could now hit the continental United States.

I think the only thing at this point that works is any leverage that we have with China itself, that if they don't act, then they can either trade with North Korea or they can trade with us. That ought to be a pretty easy deal for them to make. The economy in North Korea is in shambles. The people are starving. The people are repressed by their own illegitimate government. So there is not a lot of trade. It is not of great import to China. In fact, their relationship with North Korea—I think the way they look at it—it keeps us off balance. So they can trade with North Korea or they can trade with us.

Now, trade with the United States is very significant to the PRC. It means millions and millions and millions of jobs.

Are we willing to go that far?

Well, I think we should be when you are considering war, which is the alternative to actually getting North Korea to back off their program.

So in this case, I think we ought to make it clear to China that we are serious about this; whether it is the financial system, international banking, cutting that off. We ought to fully cut that off with North Korea and at least on the books we have, but China has ways of getting around that and proping up their ally, North Korea.

So this is the time. It has got to happen soon. North Korea has, we think, probably 20 or so nuclear devices at this point. You wait another year or 2 years, they are going to have dozens and dozens and dozens of them.

Not only is that dangerous because they have them, but it is dangerous because they will sell those nuclear devices to organizations, al-Qaida, perhaps even ISIS, or other organizations that would love to smuggle those things into this country and use them. They would use them in a heartbeat if they had them. We can't let that happen.

So things that we talked about in previous administrations and that administrations would negotiate—we had six-party agreements and we would get together—and North Korea would agree:

Okay. For food and fuel, we will end our nuclear program.

On the books it was ended, but underground or in the mountains, it was continuing.

Both previous Republican and Democratic administrations essentially let that happen, and it was bad, but they couldn't reach the United States. Now they can reach the United States.

So we are at that time now that years ago we warned about. We are there now. So I would strongly encourage this administration to take this seriously and do whatever is possible, short of war—we want to avoid that if at all possible—to make sure that China finally leans on North Korea to back down.

Mr. Speaker, I thank again the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH), who is doing a fine job as chair of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee. I also thank him for the opportunity and pulling this together this evening.

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the kind words, and I look to follow in his footsteps.

I want to also give a shout-out that the first version of the six assurances, Mr. CHABOT introduced to Congress on October 28, 2015, what the six assurances were proposed to be, and we will read those later on.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE). Judge POE has been a strong supporter of the whole Asia-Pacific region and he has got some wise words that I think we all can learn from.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman holding the Special Order on China.

It is important that Americans know who the Chinese are, what they are up to, and what their plans are in the future.

We will start with North Korea. No question about it: China could rein in North Korea and little Kim if China wanted to. They don't want to. That is why he is a menace to not only that region, but to the rest of the world. But China could rein in little Kim. They are storing millions—maybe billions—of dollars in assets in China. They could freeze those assets. They could cut off trade with North Korea.

China must understand that it is in their interest that North Korea not get nuclear weapons; not necessarily our interest, but their interest. When they come to that realization—which I think it is in their interest that North Korea be reined in to make sure that they don't use nuclear weapons or continue to develop nuclear weapons or use weapons against any of their neighbors—then North Korea will cease its belligerent activities.

The key lies with Beijing. If they make that decision, the world will be safer. If they don't make that decision, the world and Beijing will not be safer either.

Also, I want to point out kind of their philosophy, why they act the way they do.

Beijing has, first of all, little regard for the lives of the millions of Chinese citizens. China's communist regime shares more values with the communist North Korea than it does the U.S.

For decades, Beijing's human rights record has been among the worst in the whole world. It has persecuted not

thousands, but millions of people who are not followers of communism and Maoism.

Mr. Speaker, remember, communism—because China is a communist nation, although it is not really politically correct to say that much anymore, they are a communist nation that teaches against God, and their God is the state and tells the people you have to worship the state.

So when you have an atheistic regime in charge, you can see why they persecute their own people and torture not only Christians and Muslims, but Tibetans and other people who don't agree with their atheistic philosophy.

We need to be sure, as a country built on religious freedom, that we call China out for its abuse and persecution of its own people. I know we trade with the Chinese. They are a big trading partner. I don't think trade and money ought to get in the way of calling China out for abusing the people who live in China and abusing their rights of religious freedom. We can't turn a blind eye to that merely because we trade with them as a major trading partner.

We have learned through history that regimes that oppress their own people just seem to have ambitions beyond their own borders and subjugate those people as well.

□ 2030

The South China Sea, most Americans probably don't even know where that is. South China Sea is an area, it is a trading lane, navigation lane. It has been a trading area.

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of this Special Order is to draw attention to what China is doing, and I think, as Mr. CHABOT brought up, we are not against China. It is the practices that they are doing that we need to make sure that the American people know, the American people know what is going on, the amount of theft that we see, intellectual property, that costs the American taxpayers between \$300 billion and \$600 billion.

I have been at expos held by the Department of Homeland Security where they have counterfeit products that come from American manufacturers that are in China on goodwill, good faith efforts to create a good product, to create jobs in China, but yet that product winds up being counterfeited by Chinese companies that we think the Chinese Government—and we have evidence that they are complicit in it. They are selling products against our own competition, our own manufacturers in this country, and it is eroding the American economy, and China gains from this. This is a practice that has to be stopped, and we have to stop allowing this to happen.

One of the other things, if we look back over history, in the 1840s, there were the opium wars between the United Kingdom and China. A lot of opium and drugs flowed into China, and it hurt the Chinese population. At one

point, 90 percent of the males in China were hooked on opium.

Yet today, in the 21st century, we are seeing the reverse of that, and we are seeing narcotics flow from China, or precursors of synthetic opioids flow into Central America, to Mexico, to come into our borders. There is no medicinal use for fentanyl other than pain control, or heroin. Heroin has no medicinal use, very limited.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), who, in the last Congress, introduced the Comprehensive Fentanyl Control Act to combat illegal fentanyl, a synthetic opioid, coming from China.

Not only do they send the precursors, they send the presses to create the pills into these other countries. Again, it does not serve us or the American people or our economy at all.

If you are a trading partner and you want to go by the rule of law and you want to, hopefully, in trade, do what is best for your country, but you also want to have a benefit for your trading partner, this is a one-way street, and it is going to have to end.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand action from our Chinese counterparts in targeting fentanyl traffickers. This poison is 50 times more powerful than heroin and is responsible for thousands of American deaths.

Street dealers import fentanyl from China and then mix it with heroin and deal it on unsuspecting users in packages stamped with names such as "Pray for Death." That product was confiscated in my hometown yesterday in Staten Island.

These mixes of deadly substances is why, as the gentleman mentioned, I introduced the Comprehensive Fentanyl Control Act, asking our country to prohibit the online sale of presses in which fentanyl is pressed into these imitation tablets that unsuspecting users will take, unknowing that fentanyl is part of that pill.

Fentanyl is dangerous even to our authorities. Police officers, firefighters, first responders have overdosed from contact with fentanyl during drug busts. I have spoken to far too many families who have lost sons and daughters, first as the district attorney of Staten Island and now as a Congressman.

The Chinese Government, as my colleagues have said, tries to control their own citizens. Well, now it is about time they control the fentanyl that is coming out of their country.

This past fall, President Trump extracted promises that the Chinese would curb their export of fentanyl. Now it is time for the Chinese to take action.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership in this area. I thank him for yielding to me to discuss this important matter to every part of our country. No one is immune from it.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from New

York (Mr. DONOVAN) has done with the Comprehensive Fentanyl Control Act to combat illegal fentanyl. I thank him for his participation, being on the committee, and his passion for what he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a good friend of mine and a good Member of Congress, to add to this discussion.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), my good friend. I appreciate his work on this and for calling this Special Order together tonight.

Once again, it is the time of year where I have the somber privilege to come to the floor and extend happy birthday wishes to Chinese human rights defender and prisoner of conscience, Zhu Yufu.

What should be an occasion for celebration remains marred by the fact that, on February 13, Zhu Yufu will spend his 65th birthday in a Chinese prison. This will mark his seventh consecutive birthday behind bars, another birthday separated from his family and children.

Although isolated, Zhu is certainly not forgotten. He has been a fervent champion for human rights in China for decades. He gives voice to a very fundamental and foundational principle: all people everywhere should have the basic freedom to determine the course of their lives and express themselves according to their convictions without fear of government repression. For living out that conviction, he languishes in a Chinese prison in poor health and with irregular access to medical care.

Stifling voices like Zhu's does not silence their cry nor weaken their cause. On the contrary, it shines a light on their plight and renews and strengthens the effort to end repression and injustice in China, as well as in other places around the world.

As long as Zhu Yufu remains incarcerated, I will continue to call upon the Chinese Government to provide him with sufficient food, care, and medical attention, and I will continue to call on the Chinese Government to release Zhu Yufu from prison.

In honor of Zhu Yufu, I would like to read a short poem that he wrote, and it was this poem that led to his arrest and imprisonment. I quote from his poem:

It's time, people of China! It's time. The Square belongs to everyone. With your own two feet, it's time to head to the Square and make your choice. It's time, people of China! It's time.

A song belongs to everyone. From your own throat. It's time to voice the song in your heart. It's time, people of China! It's time. China belongs to everyone. Of your own will, it's time to choose what China shall be.

Zhu, you are not forgotten. Happy birthday, and may God grant you the strength and His presence and the hope that you will celebrate your next birthday in freedom.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks by Mr. HULTGREN. He did a

great job, and I hope that guy gets released.

The gentleman brought up a very good point, and this is something I have noticed. I am so blessed, and I know we are so blessed to live in this great country of ours. Our Founders got it right. I don't know how they did other than divine intervention, that our rights come from a Creator, not from government. Government is instituted by we the people to protect our God-given rights and our core values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our government is a government that empowers the people. Empowered people do great things. In the 19th Congress, it was said—the Chinese Government has set up a Chinese United Front, which is to show soft power in the world instead of doing the things they have done, where they go into a country, put up infrastructure, suck out the resources, and leave and don't care. So they have changed their tactics. They have gotten smart, and they started the Chinese United Front.

But in that communique that they said, it said that the role of the citizens of China is to serve the Government of China. It is the antithesis of what we stand for, and that is why I feel confident in our form of government because we believe in the people. We believe in the greatness of people.

The greatest resource a country has is not their gold, their timber, or any of that other stuff; it is the people. And our country values that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT), a good friend of mine, a passionate speaker on China who sits on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is humbling to have the opportunity to stand in this Chamber to speak on so important a subject as China's role in the world in 2018.

Having had the privilege also of leading American soldiers on foreign soil, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the last resort in any circumstance should be military action, and so I wish to make clear that the strong words that will follow are not directed to be a threat to the People's Republic of China but, instead, to be encouragement to the people thereof.

We want peace and to work alongside all nations in a community of nations, but it is our duty, as free people, to express the basic rights inherent to our very existence in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Chinese people today that we still hold these truths to be self-evident, that all people are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—this message directed, again, to the people of China because the oppressive Communist, dictatorial regime seems hell-bent upon denying these very rights not to nations across the world aside from China, but to the

very people whom they purport to serve; and in so doing, they not only oppress those people, but also perpetrate schemes that lead to a lower quality of life and enhanced threats to people across the globe.

Industrial espionage costs the very livelihoods and well-being of workers in every continent of the world. Intellectual property theft isn't about the hundreds of billions of dollars stolen from those who had the wherewithal, energy, and vision to create, but about the child who won't have an opportunity to attend college because the job that his or her parent might have had has been quite literally stolen by Chinese malfeasance.

Propping up a regime in North Korea that literally engages, in the year 2018, in the enslavement of their own citizens and turning a blind eye on those practices, which, Mr. Speaker, I suppose shouldn't be a surprise when you look at the human rights record of the People's Republic of China itself, I don't have time, nor do my colleagues, though I commend Congressman YOHO for this hour, to recount the number of victims of human rights violations, of prisoners of conscience, of victims of state oppression, of those who had the temerity to stand up and suggest that individuals have certain basic fundamental human rights only to reap horrific consequences underneath a totalitarian Communist regime in the People's Republic of China.

But in the limited time that I have, forced abortions of human life, to the tune of tens and tens and tens of millions; Mr. Speaker, child labor laws drafted by the People's Republic of China that look wonderful on the global stage, but practices that one recent survey indicated would have the entire population of the State of Ohio worth of 10- to 14-year olds working what one recent news story characterized as 16 hours a day, 28 days a month in 2018.

Their laws indicate that they have ended the practice of organ harvesting, and yet mathematical data indicates that, in China, if you are part of the ruling class, it is not hard to find that kidney, that bone marrow, that heart.

This sort of oppression is foisted upon the people of China, while all too often the United States and other nations of the world turn a blind eye not in the interest of respecting cultural differences, but in the interest of our pocketbooks.

□ 2045

We still hold these truths to be self-evident. And if I could do nothing else while I am here, Mr. Speaker, but to speak and encourage nations of the world, but, more importantly, the people oppressed by regimes such as that of the Chinese dictatorial, Communist, totalitarian state, and tell them that we understand, we have their backs, they have our support, then I will have accomplished something.

I am of an age, Mr. Speaker, when one of the images permanently seared

in my memory is of a lone man standing in Tiananmen Square facing down a main battle tank. And when I think of that image and then I think of the United States, I think of Patrick Henry, who not only said, "Give me liberty or give me death," but also said, when someone yelled from the back of the room, "Treason," "If this be treason, make the most of it."

I think of a 16-year-old girl in Farmville, Virginia, Barbara Johns, whose family had to move because she had the temerity, after discussing the Declaration of Independence with her uncle Vernon Johns, to question why there was a school that only White kids could attend.

And I think of the charge in the Constitution of the United States not to be a perfect Union, because we are not there yet, but to be a more perfect Union.

So then I contemplate my responsibility not only as a Member of this body, and it is obviously to serve the constituents of the Fifth District of Virginia in the United States of America, but also to stand up for human beings across the globe.

And China, we still hold these truths to be self-evident. We will not turn a blind eye on policies that lead to forced abortions of living humans, that lead to child labor policies of 16 hours of work a day, 28 days a month of a number of kids between the ages of 10 and 14 that mirrors the population of the State of Ohio.

We will not turn a blind eye to policies and public statements saying you have ended organ harvesting when all data indicates that you haven't. And then we will not turn a blind eye to the oppression of any minority, and particularly religious minorities, whether it is Falun Gong or Christians or Muslims in the west of China.

So I know in this age of the internet, this age of the world wide web and global communication, that the people of China, though their government seeks to inhibit the flow of information, will hear this, and the message is simple: You are my brothers and sisters. You are human beings just like us. You have the same rights that we have. You will not be given these rights by a government but by a creator or by nature, depending on your belief structure. And if you have the courage to stand up, understand this: We will support you.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and if he wants to participate in a colloquy back and forth, we have a few more minutes. But I want to touch on some issues that I think we need to draw out again. I want the American people to understand what is going on.

When you buy something that says "made in China," I want you to understand what is happening. China has gone from where they were in the 1970s and the 1960s. Richard Nixon went over there, kind of normalized relationships in 1972.

We had a relationship with Taiwan prior to that. I don't want to go into the history of the war between the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek back in the 1940s, but there was a relationship we had with Taiwan. We had a relationship with Great Britain on Hong Kong, and here we are in the 21st century.

Things have changed. Now we have got North Korea on the stage. It is a different world than what it was. We had some longstanding traditions that we stood by as a nation, and people respected that, and then I look at the trade imbalance that we have with China.

Here is a country that Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger in 1971 and 1972 opened up the trade that we have today, that has led to what we have today. And China has done great, and they ought to be applauded for what they have done. They have raised a lot of people out of poverty. But at what expense?

When I look at what is going on in the South China Sea, taking islands that were just coral reefs right under the top of the sea, and they have reclaimed over 4,000 acres—probably the largest ecological disaster and insult to the environment that the world has ever seen—the world stood idly by.

One country, Vietnam, stood up, took them to the court in The Hague, the tribunals. The tribunal ruled against China, and again, the world stood by, did nothing.

The previous administration had a policy of strategic patience. The profession I come from, the veterinary profession, we call that benign neglect. That is where you have a disease that is not life-threatening and you hope it goes away if you ignore it.

But what was going on in the South China Sea could not be handled with benign neglect. What happened is China militarized the islands that they built, even though they said they wouldn't.

And if we look at the other things they said they would help us on with North Korea, China has the biggest influence with North Korea of anybody else. Ninety percent of the trade of North Korea goes through China. China says they are there with us, but yet we know fuel is going in there, coal is going in there. They are trading with them.

In addition, they are complicit in allowing other companies to have shell companies that keep the Kim Jong-un regime afloat developing nuclear weapons. They have a hand in bringing this to a close.

I look at the trade deficit we have with China. It is over \$350 billion. Add to that the intellectual property theft, over \$350 billion, some people say up to \$600 billion. And China says: We are going to get it under control. But just last month they had a trade deficit of over \$60 billion.

I want to pose a question to the American people: Do you want a trading partner that is doing these things?

They flood our borders with illegal drugs, as you heard Mr. DONOVAN talk about. They erode our culture. They kill our citizens. They break down our culture. Do you want a trading partner that steals the intellectual property at the cost of American entrepreneurship, American intellectual property, and American jobs?

Do you want a partner that does not honor their word when they said they are going to do something? You talk to other countries around the world and they say: We like doing business with America because you have a rule of law and you will follow it. China does not.

They have halfheartedly agreed to help us with North Korea. And so when you go into a department store and you buy cheap as far as cost and it says "China" on it, "made in China," I want people to think: What are you selling? What are you buying, and what are you giving away for your future generation—not just of your kids, but for the posterity of this Nation?

And I would like to get Mr. GARRETT's response on that or anything else he wants to add as an afterthought here.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just, again, commend the Member from Florida, Congressman YOHIO, as it relates to this opportunity.

I think it is important to remember that, just like Americans, whether it was the Revolutionary War or the civil rights movement, the Chinese people have bled. They have sweated. They have paid the price for the basic human rights that we all enjoy here.

And again, I would commend the American consumer to consider the reality of child labor, of exploitative policies as relates to industrial espionage, of exploitative policies that literally deprive Americans of livelihoods perpetrated by the Chinese, and to shop with that in mind until we see real reform from China.

I have been frustrated heretofore with the efforts sometimes of our very own government as it relates to putting any force or its proverbial money where its mouth was to this end, but I believe there is power in the people of the United States.

And so I would encourage people, again, to shop with their consciences until we see actual acts beyond words from a regime that has a history of saying and doing all the right things in public but allowing the perpetuation of horrific, horrific circumstances on their very people at home, in private.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I need to make a correction. I said it was Vietnam that took China to court. It was the Philippines.

But along these lines that you were just talking about, when you look at the word of a nation, the integrity of a nation, I think of Hong Kong. Great Britain and China came to an agreement in 1996, 1997 that Hong Kong would revert back to China.

There was a 50-year agreement that China was to allow them to have self-

rule, the rule of law, self-determining, their own government, the right to choose that. Twenty years into this, China has got a strong influence. The freedom in Hong Kong is going backwards.

If we look at the Tibetan people, the Tibetan are probably one of the most peaceful populations on Earth, but yet I can't travel there as a U.S. dignitary or as a U.S. Member of Congress. They can't come here and be recognized. The Dalai Lama can't come here and be recognized because China gets mad. Beijing gets mad.

The Tibetan people have a way to pass on the Dalai Lama to the next generation. China kidnapped the Panchen child and said: We will replace it with who we think should be the next leader, and it is somebody they are going to groom.

And I look at our country, being a Christian. That would be like one of the kings of the Old Testament going in and stealing the baby Jesus and saying: Well, we will put in who we think should be the leader of Christianity.

It is ludicrous what is going on.

And then I think of Taiwan. Taiwan is our 10th largest trading partner, and we have had an agreement since before Richard Nixon. But during Richard Nixon's time, there have been three communiques that talked about how we were going to deal with Taiwan.

And I just want to reiterate the six assurances that Ronald Reagan and STEVE CHABOT talked about, and they are:

Number one, we did not agree to set a date certain for ending arms sales to Taiwan. Robert Gates talked about this in his book, "Duty." We had had this agreement for years, and during that time, about 2012, we were having our arms sales agreement with Taiwan. China raised holy heck about this, and our negotiators said: What is your problem? We have been doing this since the 1970s?

China's response was this, and I think this sets the tone for the future: Back then, we were weak. We are strong now.

I think that speaks loudly of China's intention.

Number two, we see no mediation role of the United States between Taiwan and the PRC.

Number three, nor will we attempt to exert pressure on Taiwan to enter into negotiations with the PRC.

Number four, there has been no change in our longstanding position on the issue of sovereignty over Taiwan.

Number five, we have no plans to seek revision of the Taiwan Relations Act.

And number six, the August 17 communique should not be read to imply that we have agreed to engage prior consultations with Beijing on arms sales to Taiwan. And we tend to stay with that in this administration.

So with that, does the gentleman from Virginia have any closing remarks?

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close.

I thank everybody for their participation, and I want the American people, again, when you look at something that says "made in China," how is that affecting the future of America?

And nothing against China. If they play fair, they play by the rules, we wish them the best of luck, but we will not be supplanted from our role in the free world.

And again, I feel confident about where America will be 100 years from now because we believe in our people, we empower our people, and we have a government that will stand and protect our constitutional rights that come from a creator.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern over China's worsening human rights record, a clear indicator of its increasing authoritarianism.

With the consolidation in power of President Xi Jinping, the Chinese authorities are making it more and more evident that they will not tolerate any internal dissent or opposition to their rule.

I am not talking about armed opposition, but about loyal opposition—the kind of opposition that takes China's constitution, its laws, and its international human rights obligations at face value.

On July 1, 1997, Britain transferred sovereignty over Hong Kong to China. Under a "one country, two systems" arrangement with London, Beijing promised to allow universal suffrage as an "ultimate aim," along with other freedoms.

Yesterday a Hong Kong court jailed democracy activist Joshua Wong for three months for blocking clearance of a protest site, his second prison sentence related to the Umbrella Movement's pro-democracy protests in 2014.

Joshua was the public face of the Umbrella Movement, which called for free elections for Hong Kong's leadership in the framework of the "one country, two systems" agreement. He had already been on bail pending the appeal of a separate six-month sentence for unlawful assembly. This time around the judge made clear that he was making an example of him because of his leadership role.

His fellow activist Raphael Wong was sentenced to four and a half months, and several other activists received suspended sentences.

What's notable about this story is that after the protests, Joshua and Raphael went on to run for seats in the Hong Kong parliament. They didn't radicalize or take up arms. They stood up for their principles. And now they're in jail.

I have often stood on the floor of this House to call for respect for the human rights of the Tibetan people in China.

Just a few months ago the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I co-chair, held a hearing on the repression of religious freedom in Tibet.

Tibetan Buddhists face extensive controls on their religious life—an intrusive official presence in monasteries, pervasive surveillance, limits on travel and communications, and ideological re-education campaigns. Religious expression and activism have been met with violent repression, imprisonment and torture.

As of last August, 69 monks, nuns or Tibetan reincarnate teachers were known to be

serving sentences in Chinese prisons—although the real number is likely much higher.

And the Chinese government continues to claim the prerogative to decide who will succeed His Holiness the Dalai Lama, the highest figure in Tibetan Buddhism, who is now 82 years old.

This extreme Chinese interference in the physical and spiritual lives of Tibetans occurs even though the Tibetans seek only to fully exercise the autonomy guaranteed them by the Chinese constitution and China's "Law on Regional Ethnic Autonomy." In the late 1980s the Dalai Lama proposed the Middle Way Approach as a path toward Tibetan autonomy within China, and he has pursued that path through non-violence ever since.

Then there are the Uyghurs. Like the Tibetans, the Uyghurs are the victims of restrictions imposed by the Chinese authorities on their religious, cultural and linguistic practices.

The repression of Uyghurs has increased since July 2009, when a police attack on Uyghur demonstrators led to rioting and nearly 200 deaths. Between 2013 and 2015, clashes involving Uyghurs and Xinjiang public security personnel led to hundreds more deaths.

In the aftermath of these kinds of fatal encounters, the Chinese authorities have claimed the Uyghurs were carrying out or preparing to launch attacks against government property or civilians. But credible human rights groups argue that many violent incidents began as peaceful protests—again, a form of loyal opposition.

Meanwhile, Human Rights Watch has reported that Chinese authorities in Xinjiang are collecting DNA samples, fingerprints, iris scans, and blood types of all residents in the region between the age of 12 and 65.

For what purpose? Are we witnessing steps toward some kind of ethnicity-based attack on the whole of the Uyghur people?

And there have been alarming reports regarding the detention and possible mistreatment of some family members of U.S.-based Uyghur rights activist Rebiya Kadeer, feared to be in retribution for her human rights advocacy efforts. This could be another instance of China's efforts to silence criticism through intimidation, detention, and threats to the families of activists living abroad.

Unfortunately, I could go on and on.

But I want to close with recommendations.

I am guided by two principles. We as Americans must defend human rights and democracy, values that have made us a great nation. And there must be consequences for bad behaviour.

But as Chinese authorities consistently work to undermine democratic participation within its borders and violate the human rights of their peoples, I do not see any consequences. It is time to impose some.

I urge us to start by passing two pieces of legislation on Tibet that have been introduced in the House: H.R. 1872, the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act, and H. Con. Res. 89, expressing the sense of Congress that the treatment of the Tibetan people should be an important factor in the conduct of United States relations with the People's Republic of China.

I urge the full and robust implementation of the Tibet Policy Act of 2002—including the designation of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Policy, a statutory position that the Administration has yet to fill.

I urge the robust use of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to

sanction Chinese officials responsible for grave violations of the human rights of Tibetans, Uyghurs, and the many other loyal opposition activists who have been targeted in recent years—human rights lawyers, religious practitioners, writers, artists.

I urge a united expression of support from this House for the release of Liu Xia. She should be allowed to leave China.

I urge this House to support the right of His Holiness the Dalai Lama to return to his homeland.

I urge the U.S. Consul General in Hong Kong to speak out loudly and forcefully on behalf of Joshua Wong, Nathan Law and other pro-democracy advocates in Hong Kong. We must hold China strictly accountable for the terms of the 1997 transfer of sovereignty.

These steps may not be enough to turn back China's increasing authoritarianism. But they would be a start.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTH STATE ICON MORISS TAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is recognized for 5 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me some of his time. I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, tonight it is with great sadness that I rise to pay tribute to a man who passed recently in the north State, an icon. Moriss Taylor passed last week at the age of 93. He was a cowboy singer and a local legend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know House rules require that you wear a jacket and wear a tie and it is not allowed to wear hats on the floor, so I respect that, but I will do what I can, in the spirit of Moriss Taylor, to wear the type of clothing typically you would see on his show with this Western shirt. Of course, his were much fancier than this one I am wearing here tonight in what I think is known in Nashville as the nudie jacket style, where it is very, very well decorated with rhinestones and shiny objects like that.

And so you see the gentleman right here. I mean, how can you not like that and feel at home with someone like that?

Moriss was born in Miami, Oklahoma in 1925, and at age 14 he settled in southern Butte County, in Palermo, California.

Of course, his "Moriss Taylor Show," he was the beloved host of that from 1956 to 1995 on KHSL-TV, Channel 12, from Chico, California.

□ 2100

He had an incredible 39-year run of entertaining folks each weekend. His show was a soothing blend of relaxing country western music and original music performed by himself and his many talented guests.

Many of the members of his band were people you would see just right

around Butte County in northern California that worked during the week in places that anybody would likely patronize. I have seen his band members at auto parts stores where I shop, or at the feed store where I shop over time, and many others like that. They were just regular folks in the community who were blending their talents with Moriss Taylor on the weekend and other venues around northern California.

As kids, we used to watch the show on the weekends and we grew up listening to the country music staples on his show as well as the jokes. Some might say they were corny jokes, but they were also clean jokes and something you can just have a little chuckle over and enjoy.

But they indeed were a staple, along with the country music in their own right. So, for example, I have got to share a couple of them.

One of his jokes would be: "They say dogs make great chiropractors because they know where all the bones are."

Or, "Did you hear the one about the dentist who married the manicurist? They have been fighting tooth and nail ever since."

See what I mean?

They might make you groan a little bit, but they do make you smile, and they sure make you think of a different time when things were just a little simpler, a little more respectful, and innocent.

Moriss also hosted a weekly radio show from the 1940s until his retirement. Indeed, the show brought tremendous happiness to many people in northern California. What is not maybe as well known about Moriss is that he was also a decorated veteran of World War II, where he flew in a cargo plane between India and China. He went on to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross, which is second only in prestige to the Medal of Honor.

Again, being an Oklahoman, he moved to northern California, where he quickly became a local icon in our community. He was well loved and a great patriot.

One time, in a personal experience, I was out campaigning, going door to door, this time in Chico, California, and I happened upon his door. He opened it up, and I hadn't really looked at the walk sheet too closely at that point. It was night, so there he was, Moriss Taylor at the door. So I was kind of taken aback because here is the local legend.

He invited me right in and we sat down for a little bit, and he told me a little bit about his politics there and that he was a participant as well. It didn't come out in the show, and probably good and respectfully so. But he said: "You know, Doug, you are all right and I support you. You are doing a good job," which means a lot from a guy like that, that somehow maybe I am on the right track here.

So each week on his show they played a lot of songs and made a lot of